

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA
Application No.: 10/709,607

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-4, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori et al. (US 004642182) (hereinafter Drori) in view of Strauss (US 005401404) (hereinafter Strauss). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss and further in view of Uhlenbrock (US006858051B2) and Lavery et. al (US003413778). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss further in view of Sprouse (US002929464). Claims 5-11 and 13-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit claims 1-4, 12, and 15-17 are in proper condition for allowance and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss. The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss and further in view of Uhlenbrock and Lavery et. al. The Office Action rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Drori in view of Strauss and further in view of Sprouse. The Office Action objected claims 5-11 and 13-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In response to the rejection thereto, Applicants have amended claim 1, and hereby

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA
Application No.: 10/709,607

otherwise traverse this rejection. As such, Applicants submit that the claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-17 are novel and unobvious over Drori, Strauss, Uhlenbrock, Lavery, Sprouse or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

The features are recited in claim 1. For example, independent claim 1 recited the features.

With respect to claim 1, as currently amended, recites in part:

1.A pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, comprising:

...; and

a plurality of mesh filters for filtering the particles from the gaseous exhaust set up inside the pipe ,

....

(Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that such a pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, as set forth in claims 1, as currently amended, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Drori, Strauss, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Drori does not teach or disclose a pipe trap for filtering gaseous exhaust, comprising: "a plurality of mesh filters set up inside the pipe for filtering the particles from the gaseous exhaust" as required by the proposed independent claims 1.

Strauss (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 16-17) discloses plastic mesh separator pads 82 and

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA
Application No.: 10/709,607

84 for removing trace oil from water, not like the **mesh filters for filtering the particles from the gaseous exhaust** of the present invention. Moreover, the plastic mesh separator pads 82 and 84 disclosed in Strauss reference are used for removing trace oil from water, but the present invention (as shown in [0043]) teaches that the mesh filters are used for removing the particles from the gaseous exhaust. The function of plastic mesh separator pads disclosed in Strauss is different from the mesh filters disclosed in present invention, so that the structure of plastic mesh separator pads disclosed in Strauss is different from the mesh filters disclosed in present invention. The Strauss fails to teach or suggest the limitation of **"a plurality of mesh filters set up inside the pipe for filtering the particles from the gaseous exhaust"** as required by the present invention, as set forth in claim 1.

Furthermore, although Strauss teaches plastic mesh separator pads 82 and 84 used for removing trace oil from water, there is no teaching or suggestions for modify Drori to use the plastic mesh separator pads 82 and 84 for removing the particles from the gaseous exhaust as proposed by the Examiner.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits Drori and Strauss fail to teach or suggest the limitation of **"a plurality of mesh filters set up inside the pipe for filtering the particles from the gaseous exhaust"**, and thus the references combined do not teach or suggest each and every element claims 1. Therefore, independent claims 1 patently defines over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-17 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 12590-US-PA
Application No.: 10/709,607

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-17 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date :

March 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office

7th Floor-1, No. 100

Roosevelt Road, Section 2

Taipei, 100

Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800

Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw

Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw